

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

THE JEWISH WORLD CONSPIRACY

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion
before the Court in Berne

by

Dr. Karl Bergmeister

1938

Notes from the editor of this e-book:

- The original scanned version of this book was downloaded from nazi.org.uk in July 2012.
- All formatting & page breaks are identical to the original book.
- Some minor spelling & printing errors have been corrected.

The Jewish world conspiracy

The lawsuit over the authenticity of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which took place in Berne during the years 1934 and 1935, gave to Jewish and pro-Jewish publicists alike, the much wished-for opportunity to blazon forth into the world that in Berne, a judge after objective consideration, had pronounced judgement to the effect that the Protocols were a forgery.

It is in this sense that the Jew Alexander Stein writes in his work "Adolf Hitler, Schüler der Weisen von Zion" (Adolf Hitler, a Pupil of the Elders of Zion), Graphia Verlag, Carlsbad, 1936, and the Jew Ivan Heilblut in "Die öffentlichen Verleumder, die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion und ihre Verwendung in der heutigen Politik" (The Public Slanderers. The Protocols of the Elders of Zion and their Use in Present-Day Politics), Europa Verlag, Zürich, 1937; similarly Irene Harland, the pro-Jewish propagandist, in her book "Sein Kampf, Antwort an Hitler" (His Struggle, a Reply to Hitler), Vienna, 1936, and the Freemason Count R. N. Coudenhove-Kalergi – married to a Jewess – in "Judenhaß von heute (Jew Hate in the Present Day), Pan-Europa Verlag, Vienna-Zürich, 1935.

All the above, with apparent intent, pass over the fact that already in 1935, a short time after the proceedings in Berne, a book appeared from the pen of Dr. Stephan Vász, entitled "Das Berner Fehlurteil über die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion" (The Faulty Judgement in the Berne Protocols Case), Publishers the U. Bodung-Verlag, Erfurt, in which, from the documents submitted to the court, and the minutes of the proceedings, the author furnishes exhaustive proof of the fact that what took place in Berne was a mockery of justice.

Moreover when Jewry, with incredible frivolity, initiated the proceedings, and led them to an apparent victory, they do not seem to have reckoned with the possibility that this very lawsuit, and the far reaching research which it was to initiate, would bring to light material of so valuable a nature, that from then on, it would hardly be possible for any thinking person to maintain that the Protocols were a forgery.

In the present pamphlet, a certain familiarity with the Protocols is assumed.

1. How the Protocols came into existence.

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion form the text of a lecture under 24 headings, dealing with the political, economic and financial programme of Judaeo-Masonry for the establishment of Jewish world domination.

The authorship, time and place of the lecture, as well as the actual date at which it was written down, it has not up till now been possible to ascertain.

In the matter of the authorship, the American writer F. Fry, following upon investigations carried out in Russia by Henry Ford, states that the Protocols are the work of the Jewish writer and leader Achad Haam (Ascher Ginsberg), and that they originated in Odessa. Certain circumstances go to show that the Protocols – perhaps following upon the lines of a concept by Achad Haam – formed the subject of a lecture in French Masonic Lodges. The bases for this supposition are the following, namely: that Freemason policy follows the lines of the Protocols, and that S. A. Nilus tells us that the copy which came into his hands in 1901 bore the following inscription: "Signed by the Representatives of Zion of the 33rd Degree."

The story generally put about by Jewry, that in the case of the Protocols, we have to do with a pamphlet drawn up by the Russian Police, and more particularly by Councillor P. J. Ratschkowsky, the purpose of which was to calumniate Jewry, is one which simply will not hold water; the so-called evidence brought forward in support of this story, being wholly without foundation of any kind.

Equally untenable is the theory emanating from anti-Jewish quarters, that the Protocols owe their origin to the Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897. There are however some grounds for the supposition that the text which had already been drawn up between the years 1890 and 1895, formed the subject of a debate at a meeting of brethren of the Bnai-Brith Order in Basel in 1897.

Proved beyond all doubt however is the fact that the first person to possess a copy of the document in French, was the late Russian Major and Court Marshal Alexei Nicolajewitsch Suchotin of Tschern, in the Government of Tula. S. A. Nilus in his book "The Great within the Small" confirms this fact. It is further confirmed by S. S. Nilus, son of the above, in a written declaration dated 1936, to the effect that he personally was present when Suchotin handed the document to his father.

I was successful in finding out a further relation of Suchotin's in the person of Madame Antonia Porphyryjewna Manjowsky, née Suchotin, widow of the Russian Admiral of that name, and resident at the moment in Yugoslavia. This lady gave me on the 13th of December 1936, a written declaration to the effect that in her youth, she on many

occasions visited the Suchotins on their estate. On the occasion of one of her visits about the year 1895, she was witness of how a transcript was made of a copy of the Protocols by Suchotin's sister Mademoiselle Vera Suchotin and his niece Mademoiselle Olga Wischnewsky, later Madame Lotin.

Vera Suchotin being long since deceased, Madame Manjkowsky advised me to visit Madame Lotin who was still living in Paris. Much to my disappointment, I found that in consequence of the death of her husband Madame Lotin had become completely insane, and was now living in an asylum near Paris, and no longer capable of being interviewed.

Having regard to the date in question, the declaration of Madame Manjkowsky assumes particular importance, for the reason that in her books "Waters Flowing Eastward", p. 89, and "Le Juif Notre Maltre", p. 95, Mrs. L. Fry publishes a letter written to her on the 17th of April 1927 by Philipp Petrowitsch Stepanoff (deceased 1932) late Procurator of the Holy Synod in Moscow, in which Stepanoff states that already, in 1895 he had received a transcript of the Protocols from Major Suchotin, and adds that he received it through the intermediary of a lady in Paris.

Who this lady was, it has not been possible up till now to ascertain. S. A. Nilus also writes in his book that Suchotin, on handing the document to him in 1901, mentioned her name to him, but that he had forgotten it. In this connection Nilus's son informed me that his father had only mentioned the matter because Suchotin had made him promise to keep the lady's name a secret as long as she lived. From all this it becomes clear that a transcript of the Protocols was in existence in Russia in the year 1895 already, that is to say two years before the first Congress in Basel.

According to data furnished by Nilus's son, the first publication of the Protocols took place in the Winter of 1902/1903 in the "Moskowskija Wiedomosti". I have unfortunately not up till now succeeded in obtaining a copy of this paper. As against this, it is a matter beyond all doubt that the Protocols were published in the "Snamja", the Paper formerly edited by Kruschewan, in the numbers appearing between the 28th of August and the 7th of September 1903. It was first in the year 1905, that Sergej Alexandrowitsch Nilus included the text of the Protocols in his book on Antichrist entitled "Welikoje w Malom i Antichrist kak bliskaja polititscheskaja wosmoschnost" (The Great within the Small, and the Antichrist as a Political Possibility in the Near Future). This was in the second edition of his book, of which the first edition which appeared in 1901 did not contain a copy of the Protocols. The third edition appeared in 1911, and the fourth in 1917, under the altered title "Blis jest pri dwerech" (He is at the Doors!).

In the year 1906, the Russian author George Butmi published the Protocols in his book "Oblitschiteljenja rjetschi, wragi roda tschelowjetscheskago" (Speeches which reveal the Truth, the Enemies of Mankind), the fourth edition of which appeared in 1907.

In the rest of Europe the Protocols remained completely unknown. It was first after the World War that Russian emigrants brought Nilus's book to North America and to Germany. It was thus that a copy came into the hands of the President of the "Verband gegen die Überhebung des Judentums" in Berlin, Müller von Hausen, who had it translated in the

year 1919, and published under his pseudonym *Gottfried zur Beek*, under the title "The Secrets of the Learned Elders of Zion".

A second edition was published by *Theodor Fritsch* with the incorrect title of "The Zionist Protocols". A seventeenth edition of this brochure appeared in 1936 in the Hammer-Verlag, Leipzig, this time with the correct title "The Protocols of Zion".

2. The first Jewish attempts at defence.

In the year 1921, Jewry took up the defence against the Protocols. In rapid succession the three following articles appeared.

On the 25th of February 1921, the "American Hebrew" published an interview given by the Russian Princess *Catherine Radziwill* to the Jewish reporter *Isaac Landman*.

On the 12th and 13th of May 1921, the French Count *Armand du Chayla* published an article in two parts in the Russian paper "Posljednije Nowosti" ("Dernières Nouvelles") in Paris.

The third article was from the pen of the English journalist *Philip Graves*, and appeared in three parts in the London "Times" on the 16th, 17th and 18th of August 1921.

Princess Radziwill declared that the Protocols were first drawn up after the Russo-Japanese war and the first Russian Revolution in 1905 by the Russian State Councillor *Peter Ivanowitsch Ratschkowsky*, Chief of the Russian Secret Police in Paris, and by his agent *Matthew Golowsky*. During her stay in Paris at the time, the last named had shown her the manuscript which he had just composed, and which had moreover a large blue inkstain on the front page. It had been planned in Russian Conservative circles to incite the Czar Nicholas II against the Jews by means of this publication.

Comte du Chayla wrote that he visited Nilus in Russia in the year 1909. The latter had shown him the manuscript with the blue inkstain, and had told him that he had received it from his life-long friend *Madame Natalia Afanassicwna K.* (du Chayla afterwards stated that her name was Komarowsky) who had in turn received it from Ratschkowsky in Paris.

Philip Graves wrote that the Protocols had been composed with the aid of the "Dialogue aux Enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu", a book written by the French advocate *Maurice Joly*, the first edition of which appeared in Brussels in 1864, and the second in 1868.

The only thing that is true about these reports, with which I will deal later on, is the statement that the author of the Protocols made extensive use of Joly's book, in that he copied whole sentences, and even whole paragraphs from it. He committed an open plagiarism on Joly. This fact however cannot be taken as furnishing the least proof that the Protocols are an anti-Semitic forgery; for it is not a question of whether the text of the Protocols came into being partly through the misuse of the text of another book, but solely of whether the Protocols contain the programme of Jewish world domination, and were written by a Jew for the Jewish people. The fact that externally a plagiarism is to hand, is no proof that

the contents are a forgery. The question of forgery would first arise when it could be proved that the Protocols had actually been composed by an Anti-Semite for the purpose of slandering Jewry.

Jewry even made the attempt to bring proof of this, in that they caused Princess Radziwill to announce that Golowinsky had composed the document under the guidance of Ratschkowsky. The attempt to prove this however, as I will afterwards show, was a complete failure.

3. The Proceedings in Berne.

When, in spite of the above, the Protocols made their way round the world, and made their appearance in practically every country, and in a variety of languages, Jewry finally decided to obtain a judicial finding upon the subject.

On the 26th of June 1933, "The Federation of Jewish Communities of Switzerland" and the "The Berne Jewish Community" brought an action in the courts with a view to obtaining a judgement to the effect that the brochure by Theodor Fritsch, "Die Zionistischen Protokolle" was literary trash, and further with a view to obtaining an order prohibiting its publication. As a matter of form the action was brought against five members of the "National Front", and of the "Heimatwehr", and among them, as principal defendant, Sylvio Schnell, who had distributed the brochure at a party meeting. As expert to the Jewish plaintiffs the judge appointed Dr. A. Baumgarten, Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Basel, and as Expert to the defendants the Director of the World Service at Erfurt, Lieut. Colonel U. Fleischhauer. As presiding expert he appointed the Pro-Jewish Swiss author C. A. Loosli.

At the end of October 1934, the 16 witnesses called by the Jewish plaintiffs were heard, and on the 14th of May 1935 judgement was entered to the effect that the Protocols were a forgery and demoralising literature. No other decision was possible, because on the one hand the Marxist judge accepted the falsehoods of the Princess Radziwill and of the Comte du Chayla as correct, and consequently was bound to accept the expertises of Baumgarten and Loosli, which were founded upon these falsehoods; and on the other hand because he refused to listen to the objections raised by the expert Fleischhauer against these falsehoods. Quite apart from this, the judge went so far in his preconceived opinion that the Protocols were a forgery, and in his lack of objectivity under undisguised pressure from Jewry, that he did not even stop at deliberately setting aside the conditions laid down in the Swiss Civil Code for the carrying out of legal proceedings. Thus he only allowed the witnesses brought by the Jewish plaintiffs to be heard, whereas of the 40 witnesses brought by the defendants, not a single one was allowed a hearing. The proceedings were accordingly carried on solely upon the testimony of the Jewish plaintiffs. And further, although Swiss law demands that in the case of every lawsuit, shorthand minutes of the proceedings be taken by an official of the court, the judge did not adhere to this condition, but permitted the Jewish plaintiffs to appoint two private stenographers to keep the register of the official proceedings

during the hearing of their own witnesses. As therefore no legal record of the proceedings was kept, it follows that the whole procedure, and the verdict itself are both null and void.

In other ways also bias may be said to have celebrated triumphs. Thus the expert Fleischhauer was hindered by a variety of expedients from making use of his legal right to examine the documents of the other side; and whereas the two Swiss experts were allowed a good eight months for the preparation of their expertises, the judge demanded that Fleischhauer should prepare his expertise within six weeks. It was only after a protest, that he agreed to extend this period by the insufficient term of one month.

In consequence of all this, the principal defendant Silvio Schnell lodged an appeal through his counsel Hans Ruef.

After a lapse of two and a half years, the case was reopened in the Court of Criminal Appeal in Berne on October 27th 1937.

Messrs Ursprung and Ruef, counsel for the defendants, demanded that the verdict given in the court of first instance be quashed, and their clients acquitted. Mr. Ruef submitted that the evidence taken down during the original proceedings had not been submitted to the witnesses for signature, and argued that little credibility could in any event be attached to their statements. He pointed out moreover that all the Russian documents which had been submitted to the court by M. Loosli were uncertified copies of the originals, and that a number of mistakes had been discovered in the different translations.

Mr. Ruef finally declared that it was not possible to apply the Bernese law to the incriminated document, because its contents were of a political, and not of a moral nature.

The Assistant Public Prosecutor Loder recognised that the manner in which the official record of the proceedings had been kept in the court of first instance had not been correct, and he further recognised that a whole series of errors in the sense of the Penal Code had been committed.

On the 1st November 1937 the Appeal Court pronounced judgement in the following terms:

"The accused Sylvio Schnell is acquitted without indemnity, all elements which might constitute a basis for the charge being absent."

In summing up the President declared that any expertise on the authenticity or non-authenticity of the Protocols was superfluous. The Protocols of the Elders of Zion being a political pamphlet of a polemical order, the Bernese law did not apply. For this reason a complete acquittal had been pronounced. The President declared with emphasis that the judge in the court of first instance had no right to set on foot enquiries as to the authenticity or the non-authenticity of the Protocols for the reason that the matter was irrelevant to the consideration of whether an immoral publication was to hand.

In this important lawsuit therefore Jewry have not attained their object.

When in spite of this the Jewish press announce that all that was decided by the Court of Appeal was that the Protocols are not demoralising literature, and that the declaration of the judge in the court of first instance that they are a forgery retains its validity, this amounts to no more than a gross misleading of public opinion.

In the Court of Appeal the judgement of the first court was quashed in its entirety, and the considerations upon which the first judge based his faulty judgement, and more especially his assumption that a forgery was to hand, were deprived of all weight.

4. The supposed proofs of forgery.

Of the evidence brought by Jewry against the authenticity of the Protocols already in 1921, and in Berne in 1934/1935, the following may be said to be the substance.

The assumption made by Princess Radziwill that the Protocols were drawn up in the year 1906 after the Russo-Japanese War and the first Russian Revolution may be said to be false if only on the following grounds namely, that the text of the Protocols can be proved to have been in the hands of Stepanoff already in 1895, that in 1901 it was in the hands of Nilus, and that in the year 1903, it was published in the "Snamja". It can further be proved that in 1905, and some years previously, both Ratschkowsky and Golowsinsky were no longer in Paris. Thus does the whole catena of lies contrived by Princess Radziwill fall to the ground. This woman moreover falsely gave herself out as a princess in her interview with the Press in 1921, whereas already in 1914, after her divorce from Prince William Radziwill, she married an engineer called Karl Emil Kolb, from whom she was again shortly afterwards divorced, and in 1921 following upon of a new marriage became Mrs. Danvin. It was in vain for the expert Fleischhauer to point out to the court during the proceedings that the evidence of this woman could not be taken seriously, if only for the reason that she was a proven forger and crook. The court refused to make any investigation of her previous career. It might therefore be fitting at this point to mention some of her shady actions in the past. About the year 1900 she attached herself to the diamond mine owner Cecil Rhodes, at the time he was going to South Africa. On the grounds of pure vanity apparently she published in a paper called "Greater Britain", which she edited there, what purported to be an interview with the late Marquess of Salisbury on the political situation in South Africa. In this interview Lord Salisbury is supposed to have expressed the view that Rhodes should be advanced to the position of Premier of Cape Colony. To put the matter beyond all doubt, the Princess showed Rhodes' private secretary the text of statement purporting to be signed by Lord Salisbury, and a telegram which she stated she had received from him inviting her to an interview. It came out afterwards that the telegram was not genuine, as it was not Lord Salisbury, but the Princess who had sent it to herself, that the interview had never taken place, and that moreover Lord Salisbury's signature had been forged.

During the year 1901, she passed cheques to the aggregate amount of £ 29,000, signing them with the name of Cecil Rhodes. Following upon this she was arrested and sentenced to eighteen months hard labour. A full account of this affair, and of other exploits of this forgeress and adventuress may

be found in the memoirs of two of Cecil Rhodes' private secretaries entitled "Cecil Rhodes, his private life by his private secretary Philip Jourdan" London, 1910 and "Cecil Rhodes, the man and his work by one of his private and confidential secretaries, Gordon le Sueur". London 1913. Both books may be seen at the library of the University in Göttingen.

After leaving South Africa this woman did not alter her way of life. In 1921, she was arrested at the instance of two hotels in New York for having piled up bills for meals, and then disappeared without paying them.

A suitable witness indeed to prove that the Protocols are a forgery!

The patently false statement that the Protocols were first drawn up after the Russo-Japanese war in 1905 was very awkward to the Chief Expert Loosli, so he in his turn proceeded to falsify the evidence and with the object of adding verisimilitude to the statement made by Radziwill, he in his expertise unobtrusively altered the year 1905 to 1895. He was compelled by Fleischhauer seven months later to own up to this before the court. Even this incident produced no effect upon the biased judge. There are moreover definite grounds for the supposition that Landman laid before the Princess what was definitely a text, the main contents of which had been prepared beforehand, and which was afterwards ornamented by a few personal comments of her own. It is also stated that she was paid the unusually high sum of 500 Dollars for the interview by Lewis Marshall, the B'nai Brith Mason and leader of American Jewry. This of course was no honorarium, but hush-money.

The second in this unholy alliance was Comte du Chayla, who was shameless enough to insist before the court upon the correctness of his article (previously referred to).

It was only after the lawsuit was over, that I succeeded in discovering the whereabouts of Sergej Sergejewitsch Nilus, the son of the late S. A. Nilus, deceased in 1930, and the first publisher of the Protocols. In a detailed statement dated March 24th 1936, Nilus junior states that Comte du Chayla published his report in "Dernières Nouvelles" being fully aware that it was untrue, and thus he is a perfidious liar and slanderer. Nilus junior declared moreover that he himself was the legitimised son of S. A. Nilus, and of the latter's lifelong friend. This lady however was not Madame Natalia Afanassiwna, nor as stated by du Chayla, a Madame Komarowsky, but Natalia Afanassiwna Wolodimerow. She had never at any time been in touch with Ratschkowsky. She had moreover never had anything to do with the Protocols. Nilus junior declared himself prepared to state upon oath that he was himself present when in the year 1901, Major Suchotin, also a friend of his father's, had handed the manuscript over to him. He cannot remember having seen at the time the ominous inkstain upon the front page.

Further enquiries revealed the fact that Comte du Chayla in the year 1921, was Chief of Propaganda on the Staff of the Don Cossack Corps of General Wrangel's Army. During his employment in this capacity, he was discovered to be acting as a Bolshevik agent, and as such was arrested and condemned to death for high treason. General Wrangel however, acting under pressure from the French Ambassador quashed the sentence, and had to content himself with expelling the treasonable officer from the army.

Upon this matter and upon the previous career of the Count, State Councillor Gregor Petrowitsch Girtschitsch, formerly in the Judge Advocate General's Department of Wrangel's army and at present living in Tunis, has furnished exhaustive information in a report dated the 30th April 1936, such information having added importance in view of the fact that Girtschiisch himself conducted the case against du Chayla.

Already at the beginning of June 1936, Dr. Boris Liffschitz, a Russian Jew practising at the bar in Switzerland, and acting as counsel to du Chayla, was informed of the existence of these declarations, both of which were handed to the court. Du Chayla however omitted to bring any action for libel against S. S. Nilus. He apparently considered discretion to be the better part of valour, and that it was preferable in this instance to take the insult that he was a perfidious liar and slanderer sitting down, rather than take the risk of bringing an action against S. S. Nilus which would expose him to the danger of Nilus proving his contention true.

Yet a third witness has recently come forward in the person of Andrej Petrowitsch Ratschkowsky in Paris. He is the son of State Councillor Ratschkowsky, whom incidentally, Du Chayla falsely described as a general, a rank which he never held. In a written statement dated 13th July 1936, he states that he has searched through all the archives of his late father, which are in his possession, that is to say not only through his private correspondence, but also through all drafts of reports sent to the authorities in St. Petersburg, and that nowhere has he been able to detect the smallest trace of his father ever having had anything to do with the Protocols. He had moreover never had so much as a hint from his father that the Protocols were known to him. His father had never been an Anti-Semite, he had had Jews as friends and collaborators, and more particularly at the time of the publication of the Protocols, his Secretary was the Jew M. Golschmann. Finally his father was never acquainted with the fabulous Madame Komarowsky, who was supposed to have handed the document over to him.

Through the reports of those who might be described as the most telling witnesses in the case namely Nilus junior, Girtschitsch and Ratschkowsky junior, light has finally been brought to bear upon the forger's den. The statements of the crook and ex-Princess Radziwill, now Mrs. K. Danvin, and of the Bolshevik Agent and traitor Comte du Chayla are in all essential points untrue. State Councillor Ratschkowsky had never on any occasion anything to do with the Protocols. Nilus's lifelong friend who according to du Chayla was the go-between who handed him the Protocols, was not called Komarowsky, but Wolodimerow, and was never in contact of any kind with Ratschkowsky.

Apart from this question, the research into the origins of the Protocols must be carried out to its very last detail. It would be particularly important to find out from whom Major Suchotin received the Protocols in 1895, or at an earlier date. Here we find ourselves at a dead end, which is all the more difficult to overcome, as the supposedly non-Jewish Soviet State puts difficulties in the way of all enquiries which are likely to prove disadvantageous to the Jews. Moreover the former Member of the Duma, Colonel Baron B. Engelhardt, in a communication from Riga, dated the 2nd April 1935, states that in the Spring of 1917, immediately after the formation of the Provisional Go-

vernment by the Freemason Prince Lwow, it became the principal care of that government to remove from the Ministry of Home Affairs and from the Police Department all confidential documents having relation either to Jewry or to the Protocols.

All files and documents of a nature disagreeable to Jewry were collected, and under orders from Prince Lwow handed over against written receipt to the Jewish Politician Winawer, a member of the Masonically influenced Miljukow party. From this time onwards the material in question completely disappeared.

The expert Loosli did it is true, succeed through the intermediary of the Jewish solicitor Tager in Moscow in borrowing from the Soviet government documents for the composition of his expertise. These however, in spite of desperate efforts on the part of Loosli to nail down Ratschkowsky as the forger of the Protocols, do not afford the smallest ground for this assumption. Moreover apart from this, these documents of which Loosli was as proud as he was of the forgeries of Radziwill and of du Chayla, contain nothing whatever relating to the authorship of the Protocols.

The fact that the authorship and the time of the composition of this document still remain a mystery, does not justify the assumption that the Protocols are an Anti-Semitic forgery; and even less, when the fact is taken into account that their contents are in complete and accurate accord with other Jewish writings, as also with the political occurrences of our time. This document has been in existence for many decades, and its validity has never yet been legally disproved. As long however as a forgery has not been proved, this document may be looked upon as genuine. For it is the inauthenticity of a document which must be proved by those who would attack it, and not its authenticity by those who would defend it. The Berne lawsuit has not cleared up the situation in any way; for of all the theses which have been brought to prove forgery, there is not one that will hold water. One and all rest upon a gross perversion of the facts. Only the guilty, and those who are afraid of the truth, make use of such methods as were used in Berne.

5. Three orthodox Jews stand for the Authenticity of the Protocols.

If up till now I have been principally concerned in the refutation of the assertions made by the opposing side, and have been able to show that Jewry have not been in the position to bring any valid evidence in support of forgery, I will now discuss a few important cases which go to show the authenticity of the Protocols. In this connection, I will quote the declarations of three orthodox Jews.

About the year 1901, in the small Polish city of Schocken, now called Skoki, there lived one Rudolf Fleischmann, an assistant Rabbi, and slaughterer by trade. With this person the local Public Prosecutor, M. Noskowitz, entered into friendly relations. Fleischmann, whose honour had suffered serious injury at the hands of the Chief Rabbi Dr. Veilchenfeld, in that the latter had assaulted his fiancée, complained bitterly to his Christian friend, and related to him much in regard to the anti-Christian writings of the Jews. In this fashion they came to speak about the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which at the time were already known in Russia. As Noskowitz has asserted in writing, Fleischmann assured him that the Protocols really did exist, and that they were no forgery. Moreover that they were positively of Jewish origin. He further laid it on him as a duty, to warn his Christian co-religionists and co-citizens of the Jewish danger.

Noskowitz relates a second instance also. In the year 1906, he put the question direct to the well known Rabbi Grünfeld of Swarzedz in Poland, as to whether the Protocols were genuine or not. Thereupon Grünfeld gave him the following characteristically Jewish answer: "My dear Herr Noskowitz, you are too curious, and want to know too much. We are not permitted to talk about these things. I am not allowed to say anything, and you are not supposed to know anything. For God's sake be careful, or you will be putting your life in danger."

We are in possession of a further statement from the Russian Captain George (Our readers will understand that we cannot give his real name, as we otherwise might endanger the lives of his relatives in Soviet Russia.) In February 1924, in Jugo-Slavia, he visited the Jew Sawelij Konstantinowitsch Ephron, who was a refugee from Soviet Russia. Ephron in his early days had been a Rabbi in Vilna. He went over however to the Greek Orthodox Church, and became a mining engineer in St. Petersburg. He was moreover an author, and wrote under the nom de plume of "Litwin". He was the Editor of the Monarchist paper "The Light", and was a contributor to "The Messenger". He was also the author of the drama going under the name of "The Smugglers", which contains much severe criticism of Jewry. In consequence of this, he was brutally assaulted by some Jews, and his life being threatened when the Bolshevist revolution broke out he had to fly from his country, arriving finally in Serbia, where he found asylum in a cloister in the neighborhood of Petkowitz in the district of Schabatz. It was there that he died in the year 1926.

When on a certain occasion Captain George questioned him on the subject of the genuineness of the Protocols, Ephron declared with emphasis that he had for long been well acquainted with their contents, indeed for many years before they were ever published in the Christian press. Ephron's words were written down by Captain George who made sure of the matter by obtaining a sworn statement regarding his bona fides from the Arch-Priest of the Russian Church in Paris in the month of October 1928.

Both written declarations namely that of Public Prosecutor Noskowitz, and that of Captain George were included by Lieut. Colonel Fleischhauer

in the expert report which he rendered to the Court in Berne. Like all other evidence offered by Fleischhauer however, these witnesses were completely disregarded by the Marxist Judge.

The case of Ephron interested me quite exceptionally, and I therefore got into touch with different colonies of Russian emigrés with a view to finding people who had been acquainted with him. The results were altogether beyond my expectations. I discovered a Russian who had formerly fought in Wrangel's Army, Wassilij S. (His real name is also concealed) who had made friends with Ephron at Petkowitz and who actually handed me a short treatise upon the Protocols in the Russian language written by Ephron himself. It is actually the concept of a letter addressed by Ephron in the year 1921, to the Russian Emigrant paper, edited by Burtzew in Paris, "Obschtscheje djelo" (La Cause Commune). Ephron had at about this time read an article in this paper, in which a writer by name of A. J. Kuprin, questioned the genuineness of the Protocols, and pretended to show that they were a forgery on the assumption that the Jews were incapable of producing an anti-Christian work of this description. The indignant Ephron thereupon wrote the following letter to the Editor:

"In my quiet cloister (I am living in a Serbian monastery.) it is seldom that I see a newspaper. The other day however a copy of the "Obschtscheje djelo" came into my hand, and in it I read a feuilleton by A. J. Kuprin entitled "Guslitzkaja Fabrika". In this feuilleton Monsieur Kuprin discusses the Zionist Protocols of Nilus, and describes for the benefit of the reader the impressions which he gets from the perusal of this book. Whatever conclusion he comes to in this instance in regard to the genuineness of the Protocols, is a matter of little or no interest to me, for in the matter under consideration, Monsieur Kuprin cannot be considered an authority in any sense of the word. In spite of the above however, my attention was drawn to certain statements in this feuilleton. Monsieur Kuprin writes: "What surprises one in the Protocols is this downright, blind, stupid, one might say uniform hate against Christianity, which only an unimaginative and commonplace Jew-baiter, writing in accordance with his feelings against the Jews, could ascribe to the Elders of Zion. Every word of these Protocols breathes blood, revenge, slavery, destruction and ruin. One does not only feel the deadly and poisonous power of the word, but also the paralysing commonplace. When the diplomats of two different countries set out to ravish a portion of a third, or when two financiers set about plucking some trustful pigeons, they do not usually call things by their proper names, but are wont to conceal the hard reality with kindly words and tasteful forms. These 70 Elders, the highest authority of an intelligent people, and no doubt themselves also highly cultivated persons, would it is clear be ashamed of such a primitive and pogrom-like brutality as is attributed to them in the Protocols."

"The above quotation from the article of this well meaning author breathes passionate resentment against the Protocols, and the Christian conscience of the writer cannot reconcile itself to the wickedness and the hate against Christianity with which the Protocols are per-

meated. He is unable therefore to acknowledge that they are genuine, and out of goodness of heart he cannot recognize them. Thus must it be. It is difficult to come to terms with life when such wickedness and such hatred found to exist. To an author brought up and educated in Christian ethics, they may seem impossible and an absurdity. But nevertheless ... This wickedness and this hatred of Christianity among the chosen people have both existed in the past, and exist up to the present day."

"I propose to the well meaning author that he communicate with Monsieur Pasmanik, and ask him to be kind enough to translate the following words taken from the prayer which every Jew is bound to repeat thrice daily. (I take it that Monsieur Pasmanik is cognisant of ancient Hebrew, and is also familiar with the prayers.)

"SCHAKETZ TISCHAKZENU', SAWE TISSAWENU, KI CHEREM, "HU"...

"These words, I repeat it, and I hope that Monsieur Pasmanik will confirm what I say, are repeated three times a day by every Jew in his prayers. Now if Monsieur Pasmanik will accurately translate the words of the Hebrew prayer, and Monsieur Kuprin comes to hear of their meaning, he will surely understand that as a Christian, and as a man of honour, he is bound publicly to withdraw what he has said in the above quoted statement, a statement clearly dictated by goodness of heart, and from feelings of Christian charity, and in no way attributable to any knowledge of Judaism, or of Jewish ethics."

P. S. If in the course of the next fifteen days Monsieur Pasmanik does not communicate the meaning of the Hebrew prayer to A. J. Kuprin, I will print a translation in the Nowoje Wremja, as much for his own edification, as for the edification of other writers similarly placed, who have erred in all good faith."

Upon Ephron's Russian concept the following further notes are to be found, and also a translation of the Hebrew text:

"Up to the sixties of the previous century these words were printed in the Hebrew prayer books; at the beginning of the sixties however, they were forbidden by the Russian censorship, which naturally did not prevent the Jews then, as it does not prevent them now, from repeating them three times a day.

"Schaketz tischakzenu", thou shalt utterly detest it, (the Cross of Christ),

"Save tissawenu", thou shalt utterly abhor it,

"Ki cherem", for it is a cursed thing.

"Hu", fye!" *)

Burtzew never published this letter. He also suppressed it in his evidence before the Court in Berne. Whether Ephron also sent it to the Nowoje Wremja as he intended, is not known.

It is altogether characteristic of Ephron's attitude to the Protocols, that it was just an article which pretended to prove them a forgery which

*) For this curse the Jews make use of Deuteronomy VII, 26.

he took as an occasion for repudiating any such theory. He does not express any direct opinion as to their authenticity, but it is sufficient that he denies to Kuprin the right to express any opinion upon the matter, upon the grounds that he does not understand the subject, and that he energetically repudiates the letter's attempt to establish a forgery. His attitude comes even more clearly to light in the following report compiled by Wassilij Smirinow in the presence of two witnesses on the 15th of December 1936, viz:

"After my arrival in Jugo-Slavia in the year 1921, in my capacity of an officer in General Wrangel's army, I came across a group of Russian emigrants in the village of Petkowitz, in the district of Schabatz, where it had been suggested that I should live.

"In the vicinity of this village, the Serbian monastery of St. Pelko is to be found. As I heard shortly afterwards, in this monastery lived Sawelij Konstantinowitsch Ephron, who had found a home there, as age and infirmity (he was at the time 72) prevented him from doing any active work. Ephron had come there on the recommendation of Bishop Michael of Schabatz, in whose diocese this cloister was situated. Bishop Michael had in former times been the head of a Serbian religious house in Moscow.

"It was at this time that I first began to receive the "Obschtscheje djelo", three copies of which were forwarded to me from Paris with a view to its distribution among the Russian emigrants. Ephron came to hear that I was receiving the "Obschtscheje djelo", and sent me a message through one of the Russians asking me to visit him, and saying that he would much like to see the paper in question. I visited him in the course of the next few days, and began also to send him the paper. Thus it was that my acquaintance with Ephron began.

"Later, in No. 440 of the above periodical, a feuilleton written by Kuprin appeared under the title of "Guslitzkaja Fabrika", in which he attacked the author of the Protocols for the blind and bloodthirsty hate against Christianity exhibited in them. Kuprin further expressed doubts regarding the capability of the Jews to express such sentiments. What he meant was that only the most ordinary type of Jew-baiter could ascribe such sentiments to them.

"This attitude of Kuprin to the Protocols disturbed Ephron very much, and on the occasion of my next visit, he started to relate to me the opinion which he had formed of the feuilleton in question. He had a reply to Kuprin already written, and addressed to the Editor of "Obschtscheje djelo", which he asked me to despatch. In the course of a further conversation regarding this feuilleton, he became very indignant about Kuprins' ignorance of the theme he had handled. He held him to be completely incompetent to express any opinion on the nature of the case.

"On the occasion of this conversation, Ephron handed me the concept of the letter he had written to Kuprin with the words: "Take it, my dear friend, it may perhaps be of use to you some day."

"In connection with this feuilleton of Kuprin's, there began between us the most open hearted conversations in the course of which he told me what he knew regarding the Zionist Protocols. In view of

the fact that it is such a long time ago, I cannot now remember everything that he said, but one or two leading points which have graven themselves on my memory I will now quote in inverted commas, making use to the best of my recollection of Ephron's own words. He asked me once whether I had read the Protocols through, and on my replying in the affirmative, he began to say that the Protocols of the Elders of Zion were in point of fact not the original Protocols at all, but a compressed extract of the same. Then he said to me that he was very much troubled in his conscience as to whether he should reveal the secret of their origin or not, for he did not know whether in so doing he would be doing more harm than good.

"I cannot here remember the exact course of our conversation, but as far as I know I had put to him a question regarding the origin and the existence of the original Protocols. In answer, he excitedly caught hold of me by the lapel of my coat, and said literally:

"My dear friend, in the matter of the origin, and of the existence of the original Protocols, there are only ten men in the entire world who know, and one of them is your servant." In saying these words he touched his breast with his forefinger and added: "My dear friend (this was his favourite mode of address where I was concerned), if you come to me often enough, it is just possible that I may bring myself to reveal this secret to you."

"It was a short time after this that a position was offered me in Belgrade, and to my great regret I was compelled to part with him for good. It was in this fashion that he took the secret of the Protocols with him into the grave. He died 2 to 3 years after my departure, as I afterwards heard."

"From what he told me, I learnt that he was a Jew, and that he went over to the Orthodox Church in Russia. After his conversion, he was a missionary in Central Asia, and was also a correspondent of the Academy of Science. He was moreover Editor of the paper "Istoritscheskij Wjestnik". He had a son, who had been an officer in the Russian Army.

"I have attached the aforementioned concept of Ephron's letter to Kuprin hereto.

"The above statements I am at all times ready to confirm on oath."

(Signed) Wassilij Smirinow.

Former Commandant A. M. Dept.,

Propaganda Section,

G. H. Q. South Russian Forces.

As a result of further investigation, I was fortunate enough to find yet another Russian, who over a period of years had been personally acquainted with Ephron. This was Wassilij Michailowitsch Choroschun who lived at Petkowitz in Jugoslavia, and who at the time of Ephron's residence there, was the business administrator of the monastery in the town.

Choroschun has given the following written declaration:

"During the period between June 1924 and November 1929, I was resident at the Cloister of St Paraskewa (Petka), in the Province of Schabatz in Jugoslavia. To the different duties which the Prior of this religious house, the monk Aristarch, laid upon me belonged that of conducting the business affairs of the cloister. I consequently became familiar with the archives of the cloister, and with all matters pertaining to the persons it contained."

"As regards Sawelij Konstantinowitsch Ephron, I associated with him from the moment of his arrival in the monastery, up to the time of his decease. According to the letter of recommendation from Bishop Michael of Schabatz, which was entered in our files under the number 191, Ephron arrived at the cloister on June the 7th 1921. His decease took place on the night of the 23rd of June 1925. He died alone and without witnesses. All his personal belongings, his notes, and his books were sent by General Tolstow, who was also resident in the cloister, to the office of the Agent for Russian Refugees in Belgrade at that time one Paleolog. I often had talks with Ephron. He used to tell me about his past, and used to communicate to me his thoughts upon different matters, and among them upon the Jewish question. I remember that he told me that he completed his rabbinical training at Vilna, and that afterwards he became a rabbi. He said that after he came to know of a certain secret law among the Jews (he did not say which) in which the hatred of humanity which it propounds had impressed him most, he decided to break with Jewry. After he had broken with Jewry, he entered the School of Mines in St Petersburg, and qualified there. Afterwards he took to a literary career. He became a collaborator on the "Nowoje Wremja", editor of Komarow's newspaper "Swet", and of the "Istoritscheskij Wjestnik", and Secretary of the Slavonic Committee.

It was during the time that he was with on this Committee, that he became acquainted with the Prior of the Serbian Monastery in Moscow, the Archimandrite Michael, who afterwards when Bishop of Schabatz, arranged for his reception into the Cloister of Saint Paraskewa. Ephron told me that he had two sons who had remained in Soviet Russia, and who occasionally sent him money. I remember that on the day of his death 50 Dollars arrived from one of his sons. On one occasion Ephron made me a present of Nilus's book on the Zionist Protocols. I remember that on this occasion he said to me: "They (the Protocols) are an actual fact, and every word of them is true." In his conversations on the subject of Jewry, he asserted with all emphasis, that the Jews have secret books which they show to nobody but to the initiated.

Three or four months before his death, the author Rodionoff wrote to him from Mostar urging him to reveal the secrets of Jewry. S. K. Ephron did not however wish to do this, as he was awaiting the visit of the Metropolitan Antonius, to whom he wished to reveal everything concerning the Jews. In his letters to Ephron, the Metropolitan Antonius promised him that he would visit the cloister in company with General Netschwolodow, who was coming from

Paris for the purpose. In the last few days, as he felt death approaching, Ephron often gave expression for his distress at the Metropolitan not having arrived. He was apparently possessed with a great longing to reveal to him the secret of Jewry which was tormenting him. Unfortunately the Metropolitan never came, and thus did it come about that the secret was entrusted by Ephron to no-one.

Testified by the undersigned

Wassilij Michailowitsch Choroschun,
Petkowitz, District of Schabatz, Jugoslavia.

February 3rd, 1937.

The declarations of the Assistant Rabbi Fleischmann, of Rabbi Grünfeld and of the former Rabbi Ephron taken together, give incontrovertible proof of the correctness of the assumption that the Protocols are a genuine Jewish document. Of a particularly convincing order is the information supplied by Ephron to the three Russian witnesses Captain George, Major Smirnow and the Administrator Choroschun. From his testimony the following fact also becomes clear namely that the Protocols were drawn up before the Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897, and were already known to the initiated in Jewry; and moreover that the text which we possess through the intermediary of Nilus is a compressed extract only of an as yet undiscovered, and far more extensive secret document. It is therefore of particular importance to note that in this respect, Nilus makes practically the same assumption on page 54 of the third edition of his book, namely that the manuscript which had come into his hands was evidently "a fragment only of some very much more important manuscript, of which the beginning, and many details have either been lost, or may never even have been found."

6. The Contents confirm the Authenticity.

To prove the authenticity of the Protocols from their contents, would be beyond the scope of this treatise. There exists upon this subject a literature so extensive, and more particularly in the Expertise drawn up by Colonel Fleischhauer for the lawsuit in Berne, a mass of evidence so overwhelming, that I will confine myself to the following remarks only.

It is not by any means first in the Protocols, but already in the books of the Jewish prophets that the political objectives of the Jewish people are laid down. Isaiah in particular, in chapters XL to LX promises quite undisguisedly world-domination to the chosen people. The same thing exactly is the aim of the Protocols, which may be said to differ only in the sense that they are a modern strategic plan, drawn up in a manner more suited to present-day conditions.

Countless statements from Rabbinical sources, and by Jewish politicians, documentarily attested, agree in astonishing fashion with the general lines of the Protocols.

The following fact moreover cannot be refuted namely, that the political occurrences of the present day, taking place as they do under the influence of Jewish Freemasonry, are developing in exact accordance with the lines laid down in the Protocols, and that more particularly in Soviet Russia, under "the leadership of Jewry, the Protocols have already become an accomplished fact. It is only necessary to think of the destruction of the Christian religion as ordered in the Protocols, of the destruction of all estates, of the moral poisoning of youth, and of the undermining of the family, of the enslavement of the working people, and of the famines created in a fashion so conscienceless, of the way in which Moscow organises agitation and incitement of the masses in all countries, more especially in the case of Spain, of the continuous strikes and economic crises in France, and of the subsidised and controlled revolutionary movements in Mexico and in China, to come to the only possible conclusion namely, that Jewry with the help of Bolshevism, Marxism and Freemasonry, is undeviatingly carrying out what is prescribed in the Protocols, in order to obtain for the Jewish people that world-domination which is promised to them by their God Jehovah.

This fight for world-domination has been in full swing ever since Italian Fascism put an end to the destructive activities of Freemasonry, that most dangerous of all Jewish secret societies, and since Germany has declared openly that it is the Jew, and the Jew alone who is the driving force behind the destruction of political order among the different peoples. In complete accordance with the sense of Protocol 7, the dogs of war are to be let loose against those states who desire to free themselves from the Jewish reign of terror, such states as Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Poland.

On the above subject the following forms an interesting extract from the "Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes, No 7 of the 1st of April 1937:

"A new war in defence of democracy and of alleged law is being prepared in all haste. An alliance of all the Jewish groups is already complete; it bears the official title of the alliance of the three great democracies, the English, the American, and the French. . . . Israel requires a new world war, and soon! . . . Israel is positively of the opinion that time is getting short. To them their world war is a necessity in order that, in the name of indivisible peace, all that portion of mankind who wish to cast off the Jewish yoke, may be laid low."

It is just the three countries above mentioned who to-day are completely under Jewish-Masonic control. Practically every member of their respective governments is a Freemason. In their case also in all key positions, men of Jewish origin are to be found, or persons who either as a result of marriage, or of financial obligation, are open to Jewish influence. I will in general refrain from mentioning names. I should like however to point to one man only, in regard to whom Jewry are always proclaiming that he is not a Jew namely, Stalin. But Stalin in point of fact is married to a Jewess, and his all powerful Secretary of State is his brother-in-law Kaganowitsch. Only statesmen completely blind fail to recognise that the fate of the peoples entrusted to their charge no longer depends upon themselves, and that they will most certainly bring their peoples under the Jewish Bolshevik yoke if they do not first of all unite to fight the Jewish world danger. It is neither from

Germany, Italy, nor Japan that danger threatens, but solely and only from the direction of Jewry, who in every country play a pretendedly patriotic role, but at the same time, by means of their international press, incite one country against the other, in complete accordance with the directions of Protocol 7:

"Throughout all Europe, and by means of relations with Europe, in other continents also, we must create ferments, discords and hostility. ... We must compel the governments of the Goyim to take action in the direction favoured by our widely-conceived plan, already approaching the desired consummation, by what we shall represent as public opinion, secretly prompted by us through the means of that so-called "Great Power" – the Press, which with few exceptions that may be disregarded, is already entirely in our hands."

The plan of Jewry as developed in the Protocols, becomes from year to year more clear and more terrible. Whoever still persists in refusing to recognise it, is either seriously incapable, or else guilty of a crime against his own people.

And once again I will take as my authority a Jew, who unconditionally stands for the authenticity of the Protocols, and who asserts that Jewish mentality alone could draw up a programme like that of the Protocols, so that if only on these grounds, it is not possible to doubt the authenticity of the document. The authority referred to is the late Arthur Trebitsch, author of "Deutscher Geist oder Judentum", published 1921, on page 74 of which we find the following:

"Anybody who like the author, has long since realised, seen, and heard with ominous dread, all the thoughts, aims and intentions derived from the entirety of our economic, political and intellectual life, and expressed in those secret documents, can with absolute confidence assert that they present the most genuine and unalloyed expression of that versatile spirit which is striving towards world-domination; and that an Aryan mind, however far it might have been driven along the road of forgery and calumny by Anti-Semitic rancour, could never, under any circumstances have devised these methods of action, these underhand expedients and these swindles as a whole."

A Conference of the World Service, the international organisation for defence against Jewish aggression in all countries, took place in Erfurt from the 2nd to the 5th of September of this year. Distinguished experts, authors and political leaders, more especially from the following countries, took part: Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Great-Britain, Finland, Greece, Holland, Italy, Jugoslavia, Canada, Lettland, the U.S.A., Norway, Austria, Poland, Russia (Emigration), Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, South Africa, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

After the commission appointed to enquire into the authenticity of the Protocols had rendered a report of its two years of activity, the Congress unanimously adopted the following.

Resolution.

"That the present Conference of the World Service taking place at Erfurt from the 2nd to the 5th of September 1937, in which many experts, authors and political leaders from more than 20 different countries are taking part, passes the following resolution relative to the authenticity of "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion":

That the verdict given in Berne on the 14th of May 1935 to the effect that the Protocols are a forgery, is a faulty verdict. That it only became possible in consequence of the Judge having erroneously based his judgement upon the expertises of the two Swiss experts recommended by the Jewish side C. A. Loosli and Professor A. Baumgarten, after he had heard the 16 witnesses for the Jewish side, and after having refused to hear any single one of the 40 witnesses brought by the Aryan side.

The verdict in Berne has not shaken the authenticity of the Protocols. For their authenticity the following irrefutable fact, among many others, bears witness namely, that Jewry in the social, political, and religious sphere, persistently model all their actions along the lines laid down in the Protocols.

"The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" are accordingly the authentic programme of Jewish world politics."